REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance are respectfully requested for claims 1, 3-7, 9-22 in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action dated December 24, 2002, the drawings were objected to; claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; claims 1,2, 4, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos. 6,356,940 ("Short"), 5,233,520 ("Kretsch"), 5,974,396 ("Anderson"), and 5,960,403 ("Brown"); claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Short, Kretsch, Anderson, and Brown as applied to claim 1, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,387,956 ("Shapira"); claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Short, Kretsch, Anderson, and Brown as applied to claim 4, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,759 ("Moore"); and claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos. 6,401,072 ("Haudenschild"), 4,951,197 ("Mellinger"), 5,787,186 ("Schroeder"), 5,332,579 ("Umbdenstock"), 6,375,077 ("Hankins"), 5,542,420 ("Goldman"), and 4,636,949 ("Longabaugh"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the Figures 4·14, stating that a descriptive label for each numbered element would enable better understanding of the figures "without substantial analysis of the detailed specification." As such, Applicant has modified these figures in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion and has provided a

redlined version and a formal version. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 8 has been cancelled. Claim 7 has been amended to provide additional "inter-relationship description between fields listed." Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 8 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 were rejected as being unpatentable over Short, Kretsch, Anderson, and Brown. Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation of "transmitting user assessments of the dietary information to the dietary information database for access by future users," which is at least supported by the specification at page 3, paragraph 1. The office action, at page 5, states that "...evaluations of the dietary information...' is taught by Short at col. 2, lines 13-21 and col. 2, lines 60-62." The passages cited by the Examiner appear to relate to suggested modifications of the user's diet that are communicated to the remote users. As amended, claim 1 clearly recites that assessments are communicated from users to the dietary information database for access by future users.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and its dependent claims 3 and 11-18, is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 was rejected under as being unpatentable over Short, Kretsch, Anderson, and Brown as applied to claim 1, in view of Shapira. Claim 3 has been amended to recite "manipulating the information further comprises evaluating the interaction between the dietary information and medication information and said table of information further comprises drug/food contraindications." The insertion is at least supported by the specification at page 13, paragraph 2. The office action, at page 7, states that "Shapira teaches the evaluation of the interaction between the dietary information and medication information as follows" and provides passages referenced at col. 8, lines 3-12, and col. 3, lines 13-17. The first passage, at column 8, provides tests under which patients were evaluated. It is not seen how this provides a prima facie case, as it fails to provide an "evaluation of the interaction between the dietary information and medication information" or the amended limitation of "drug/food contraindications." The second passage, at column 3, appears to relate to the fact that people who use monoamine oxidase inhibitors need to avoid drug interactions. The fact that certain people need to avoid drug interactions does not teach or suggest the claim 3 recitation of "manipulating the information further comprises evaluating the interaction between the dietary information and medication information and said table of information further comprises drug/food contraindications." Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of

claim 3 is respectfully requested for the above reasons, in addition to the fact that claim 3 is dependent on allowable base claim 1.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite that the computer manipulates the transmitted information to provide a summary of appropriate dietary information based on said plurality of factors, wherein the factors include anthropometric, metabolic, life stage, and dietary prescription data. The combination of references, Short, Kretsch, Anderson, and Brown, do not teach or suggest the combination of factors including anthropometric, metabolic, life stage, and dietary prescription data. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 and its dependent claims 5, 6, and 19-22 is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10 were rejected as being unpatentable over Haudenschild,
Mellinger, Schroeder, Umbdenstock, Hankins, Goldman, and Longabaugh. Claim 7
has been amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention. In the wherein
clause, the menu plan has been connected to "a user" and the nutritional and
medication databases have been supplemented with the phrase "to access
information based on nutrition and drug/food contraindications" to overcome the
rejection under section 101.

The purported motivation to combine the seven applied patents is that the patents "teach the use of databases" and "teach the use of food." Such statements are so general that their use indicates that the applied combinations are based on improper hindsight reconstruction. For example, Schroeder has nothing to do with the other references, or the claims, except for the fact that he uses the word

"anthropometric." Additionally, the rejections of claims 8, 9, and 10 do not provide any reason whatsoever why the applied combination would have been obvious at the time the invention was made.

Moreover, a prima facie case has not been made. For example, the citations to Umbdenstock and Longabaugh are not related to "a system for communicating dietary information ..." as claimed; rather, Umbdenstock relates to a method of treating addicts by ingesting a nutritional supplement and Longabaugh is directed to controlling the operation of a commercial deep-fryer cooker. In addition, the reference to col. 4, lines 33-36, of Longabaugh and the reference to col. 6, lines 59-63, and col. 20, lines 47-50, of Haudenschild are not understood in the context of the recitations of claims 7 and 9, respectively. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 9, and 10 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the application is respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance, and prompt favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response; please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #100068/51817US).

Respectfully submitted,

June 24, 2003

W. Jackson Matney, Jr.

Registration No. 39,292

CROWELL & MORING, LLP

P.O. Box 14300

Washington, DC 20044-4300

Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500 Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

• .	about e3 squares	124 ° display	benefits offered	site layout/tour	0130 membership benefits	132 consulta dietician	133 consult a physician	134' newsletter	Drivacy Statement	/ <u>438</u>			
Overview Page	D												
-	102 Interview	104 fodayls menu	this wee K's menu	<u>108</u> recipes	res faurants	in Ventory	114 / Shopping	education	Community	120 / //Festy/es	140 Fracking	142 (computations	he 150

Figure 4

OK To exter N. E. O adds/ 8/15/03

5
Te
gn
: =

		200	`	PARTERY	2 4 200	JC25 3)		
	201 oursonal data	anthropometrics	Special metabolic needs	food preferences	health status	food allergies	176 stage	dietury prescription	cooking complexity	Mealplan override	Drofessional referral	A second	
nterview Screen			<u>ν</u>										
T	102 Interview	104 today's menu	fus weeks menu	1 <u>08</u> recipes	110 resturants	in ventory	114 / Shopping	education	Community	$/rf_{6.5} + \frac{120}{4}/e_{5}$	tracking	computations	he 19

		300	`				7)		
•	301 Members	-				302 display		303 ganges	$\rho = \rho$	305
Weekly Menu Screen				<u> </u>						
ekly N										
Ne		104 today's menu	3			education			tions	

Figure 6

	401 Members							402 display			403 gauges		budget
Daily Menu Screen			7										
•	102 interview	104 Jodaus menu	this week's menu	108 Yeapes	110 restaurants	112 inventory	5 hop ping	education	118 Community	1.7e styles	140'. Tracking	142 Nombutations	150 help

Figure 7



Screen	sol members					502 Lisp/ay				503 gauges			
Restaurant Menu Screen		nd	тепо		nts			2				· SWS	
	$\frac{102}{in} + \frac{102}{ervien}$	104 to da 1/5 me	This week's menu	108 120 pes	restaurants	112 Inventory	5 hopping	116 J education	Community	$\frac{120}{l_1}$	140. Tracking	esmputations	het_{ρ}^{\prime}

JUN 2 4 2003 CA

Figure 8

JUN	1 P E 2 4 2003 ES
ATTER TO THE	ADMINON E

1						ne -		nr -			n		
	<u>601</u> sfore(s)	+0day's list	1, 603 2ntire list	edž /ist	kitchen items	606 Online gracer	aenerate/ist	on line special	609 Competitive bids	1, 612 Lisolay			
Shopping Screen													
•	interview	today's menu	this week's menu	$\frac{108}{\sqrt{e} c. \rho es}$	restaurants	inventory	114 / Shopping	educatión	20 mmon ity	1.7estyles	tracking	computations	$\frac{150}{he}$

Figure 9

	$\frac{701}{}$, , 002
Interview 104 104 menu	Food Inventory 702 Kitchen inventory	
this week's menu	build shopping list	PATER
	online gracer	JUN 2 4
110 pestaurants	competitive bids	A 1025 5
112 Inventory)
. J.		
education		
Community		
1,7 = 120 1,7 = 5ty/es		
tracking		
Computations		
<u>50</u> \(\lambda\)		

Figure 10



Education Screen								ĭ					
	$\frac{102}{10}$	104 to day's menu	this week's menu	108 recepes	110 restaurants	112 Inventary	114 J	education	Community	120 1. Festyles	140'.	Computations	150

Figure 11

١.	JUN 2 4 7	(3)

Lifestyles Screen	, news/effers	othat room	culinary travel	food camps	\$pas	rooking schools	Of rsonal chief refinals						
	102. Interview	$40a\sqrt{s}$ menu	this week's menu	<u>108</u> Γες φες	restaurants	112 Inventory	114.) Shapping	education	community	(17e styles	140. Tracking	142 U	1/50 he (10

Figure 12

Figure 13

Computation Screen	7
	utation Sci

	why	duel ser dan		13	PETPAN	TERS SWEET						
computations	calories perindinduello	grams of protein Berind indual oer										
interview	fodayis menu	this week's nem	1 <u>08</u> re c.pes	110 restauvants	112 Inventory	5 ha 1014 Shug	education	$\frac{118}{40}$ The state of the	120 lifestyles	140'.	Computations	help

Figure 14